## For the Northern District of California

28

1		
2		
3	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
4	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
5		
6		
7	PHILLIP GIPSON,	
8	Petitioner,	NO. C08-2526 TEH  ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY
9	V.	
10	MICHAEL A. SMELOSKY,	
11	Respondent.	
12		
13	The Court is in receipt of Petitioner Phillip Gipson's motion for a certificate of	
14	appealability. The motion is DENIED because the Court finds that Petitioner has failed to	
15	make a "substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right" on any of his claims.	
16	28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2); see also Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 483-84 (2000) (explaining	
17	that an applicant satisfies this standard where he or she shows that reasonable jurists could	
18	find the issues debatable or that the issues are "adequate to deserve encouragement to	
19	proceed further") (quoting Barefoot v. Estelle, 463 U.S. 880, 893 n.4 (1983)). The Clerk	
20	shall forward the case file to the court of appeals with this order. United States v. Asrar,	
21	116 F.3d 1268, 1270 (9th Cir. 1997).	
22		
23	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
24	~1.	the ffarence
25	Dated: 09/03/09	
26	UNITE	ON E. HENDERSON, JUDGE D STATES DISTRICT COURT
27		